



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/546,547	06/29/90	RAMANUJAN	

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

23M3

RAY, G

EXAMINER	
173811/770	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	10

DATE MAILED:

2308

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

03/02/93

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

a) ☒ is extended to run 3 months or continues to run from the date of the final rejection

b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed Feb. 16, 93 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- b. ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
- c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
- d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

see attached sheet

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☒ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 1-40

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because _____

5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☒ Other extra sheet enclosed

Michael R. Fleming
Michael R. Fleming
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 200

Serial No. 07/546,547

-2-

Art Unit 2308

The amendment after final filed on Feb. 16, 1993 has not been entered because the limitations such as "a plurality of bus elements, with each of the plurality of bus elements being capable of making a request for access to at least one other bus element" (claim 1, lines 2-4), "the central unit adapted to provide for an arbitrated, point-to-point coupling of a particular one of the plurality of bus elements with the at least one other bus element" (claim 1, lines 7-10), the arbitration logic being capable of granting each of the bus elements access to the at least one other bus element through the central unit (claim 1, lines 20-23), "an arbitrator coupled to the validity logic, and scheduling logic coupled to the port multiplexer and the arbitrator" (claim 21, lines 2-4), "the port select logic is responsive to the at least one function code (FC) line to switch ..." (claim 25, lines 5-7); "combining logic for accepting a plurality of parallel inputs, the plurality of parallel inputs at least equal to the number ..." (claim 30, lines 5-7), "coupling ... via one of a plurality of first bus inputs" (claim 33, lines 4-6) and "providing for an arbitrated, point-to-point coupling of a particular one of the plurality of bus elements with at least another bus element (claim 33, lines 13-15), etc. raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.